

The University of Chicago

THE
FIRST EDITION OF THE *DUNCIAD*

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE
1935

By
WILLIAM KNOX CHANDLER

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
MODERN PHILOLOGY
Vol. XXIX, No. 1, August 1931

1935

The University of Chicago

THE
FIRST EDITION OF THE *DUNCIAD*

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE
1935

By
WILLIAM KNOX CHANDLER

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
MODERN PHILOLOGY
Vol. XXIX, No. 1, August 1931



THE FIRST EDITION OF THE *DUNCIAD*

IN 1854 readers of *Notes and Queries* developed a strong interest in the bibliography of Pope's *Dunciad*. On October 14 of that year W. J. Thoms proposed to make a bibliography of the poem and, to aid him in that design, requested owners of copies to send them to London.¹ With the assistance of Charles Wentworth Dilke, he sorted and examined the copies submitted, and on December 16 published a descriptive list of the various editions—the first formal bibliography of the *Dunciad*.²

The first four editions in Thoms's list, in the order in which they were thought to have been issued, are:

- A, a duodecimo in half-sheets
- B, an octavo in half-sheets
- C, a duodecimo in half-sheets
- D, a duodecimo in half-sheets with "The Second Edition" on the title-page³

All of these editions were printed in London in 1728.

It is now known that A was not a duodecimo but either an octavo identical with B (according to Professor Griffith),⁴ or a small paper copy of B worked in foolscap octavo (according to T. J. Wise).⁵ Whether A was the regular crown octavo issue of B or a foolscap issue from the same setting of type cannot, it seems, be determined; but its identification as an octavo removes it from the list as a duodecimo, and, virtually, from any consideration at all, since no one has pointed out any textual differences between it and any other London octavo of 1728, or has really demonstrated that any two octavos of the *Dunciad* differed in size of paper before being trimmed. A is therefore omitted from this discussion, or (perhaps more accurately) is identified with B.

¹ *Notes and Queries*, 1st series, X, 298.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 477-78. Thoms used letters of the alphabet to distinguish the various editions. His list has been added to at intervals by Solly and others; it appears with some additions in Vol. IV of the Elwin-Courthope edition of Pope's *Works*, pp. 299-311.

³ Since this list, it has developed that there were two variants of "The Second Edition"; but the only difference between the two is on the title-page, hence it will not be necessary to distinguish between them in this discussion.

⁴ *Alexander Pope: A Bibliography*, I, Part I (Austin, Tex., 1922), 152-55, and I, Part II (Austin, Tex., 1927), 577-83.

⁵ *The Ashley Library: A Catalogue*, IV (London, 1923), 15, 19-20.

After A was shown to be an octavo, collectors, dealers, and bibliographers so far accepted Thom's list as to believe that B was the first issue of the first edition, and that C, a duodecimo, was a second issue.¹ Though Griffith questioned this belief in 1915,² it was not until 1922, in his *Bibliography of Pope*, that he ventured to place first, as the genuine *princeps*, the edition numbered C by Thoms, giving second place chronologically to B.³ The evidence, he admitted, was ambiguous. His argument was built on the assumption that the poorer typography of the octavo resulted from the untying of some of the forms in order to change the signature marks from a duodecimo to an octavo.

Some of the typographical differences between the two issues are differences in alignment and spacing between words. Obviously it is impossible to prove definitely either that the copy with perfect alignment is the earlier copy or that it is the later one. Other variations noted by him are due either to faulty typesetting or to the dropping-out of letters. Of this nature is the catchword on page 9, which appears (correctly) "As" in the duodecimo C, while the s is not present in B; similarly, on page 29 the catchword "This" is correctly printed in B, but in C it is without the s. In these two cases C is correct once and incorrect once; so also is B. Any conclusion drawn from such data must, therefore, be extremely tenuous.

Three differences of a slightly different character, however, supplied Griffith with a basis for his argument. In the first line of Book I, issue C reads "Books. . . ." while issue B reads "Book. . . ." Griffith believes that the "compositor's carelessness in reworking the forme" was responsible for the dropped letter s.

On page 5 the signature "B3" appears in both issues. Of this he writes:

In an octavo book printed in half-sheets, it was uncommon to place a signature mark on the third leaf; but it was done occasionally. No other third leaf is marked in this 8vo. In a duodecimo printed on half-sheets, it was the rule, of course, to mark the third leaf.

His conclusion is, then, that the printer forgot to remove the signature "B3," placed correctly enough for C, in re-working the forms for B.

Finally, in a note on page 5 C has the word "Enterludes" while B has "Interludes"—a difference in spelling which he attributes to the

¹ See, for instance, the lists of Lefferts and of the Grolier Club.

² "The *Dunciad* of 1728," *MP*, XIII (1915), 14.

³ I, Part I, 152-55.

printer since the entire note was reset between the printing-off of the two issues.

These points of difference, as he admitted, did not settle the priority of issues, but he felt that the presumption was in favor of the duodecimo C as the first issue.

In the following year (1923) Mr. Wise replied to Professor Griffith by elaborating an argument to prove that B was first.¹ He did not attempt to discuss any of Griffith's points except two—those relating to the reading "Books" and to the spelling of "Interludes." His argument on the first was:

Had the octavo been printed off last, after the duodecimo copies had been struck off, its text would have presented the later reading "*Books and the man I sing*," because that change was made whilst the duodecimo was passing through the press, or was being prepared for it, and constitutes the striking difference between the first and second issues of the first edition of the Satire.

This reasoning certainly appears to be a clear case of *petitio principii*. Obviously if "Books" is the "later" reading, B, which reads "Book," must have been printed first, and C, which reads "Books," obviously second, but Mr. Wise failed to prove that "Books" was the "later" reading. As a matter of fact, it seems to have been Pope's intention in January, 1728 (a few months before the poem was published), to use "Books,"² and it is known that he personally read the proof for the first issue.³

From the spelling of "Interludes" Mr. Wise concluded that, since the second edition (D) of the poem follows the spelling ("Enterludes") of the duodecimo C instead of the spelling ("Interludes") of B, B was printed first. He did not seem to take into consideration that the note containing this word was reset for both issues of the first edition and also for the second edition.

Interesting as are these two differences, it must be acknowledged that neither one of them presents evidence either for or against B or C as the *princeps*.⁴

¹ *The Ashley Library: A Catalogue*, IV, 15 ff.

² E-C, VII, 110.

³ See the letter from Prince to Nichols, October 5, 1793, in *Literary Anecdotes*, III, 705.

⁴ Mr. Wise raised one more objection to the priority of C: "That the earliest form of *The Dunciad* was octavo, and that the book was afterwards reimposed as a duodecimo, cannot I think be doubted. It is hardly credible, as Professor Griffith has suggested, that the work should first be set up in duodecimo, then altered to octavo, and then shifted back to duodecimo" (*op. cit.*, p. 15).

It does, perhaps, seem irrational to print first in duodecimo, then in octavo, and then again in duodecimo—all three from the same setting of type. But until we know much

Four years later (1927), in the second part of his *Bibliography*, Professor Griffith submitted Mr. Wise's argument to an examination and showed that no piece of evidence there adduced served the purpose for which it was cited.¹ He was careful, however, to acknowledge again that all the points raised up to that time left the matter still uncertain though with a probability that Thoms's C was the first issue of the first edition.

This uncertainty can, I believe, be removed by a more complete examination of available evidence, both external and internal. The result of such an inquiry is the establishment of the duodecimo C as the *princeps*.

I. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

Pope's own bibliographical notes are available to most students of the *Dunciad*, but his statements have been made light of, because perhaps, of what Mr. Wise refers to as Pope's "known contempt for veracity" where the history of his own publications was concerned.² As the only bits of contemporary evidence available, however, they deserve much more attention than has been accorded them.

On page 87 of the first edition of the enlarged *Dunciad* of 1729 appears the caption "Preface prefix'd to the five imperfect Editions of the *Dunciad*, printed at Dublin and London, in Octavo & Duod." Concerning this notation Mr. Wise says that the caption was "perfectly correct," and that the five editions were:

1. An edition comprising the duodecimo C, the octavo B upon large paper, and the octavo A upon small paper [see the discussion of the two octavos on p. 59]
2. Both variants of "The Second Edition"
3. Variant *a* of "The Third Edition"
4. Variant *b* of "The Third Edition"
5. The genuine Dublin octavo

more about the vagaries of early eighteenth-century printing it is impossible to use this as an argument. There could have been several reasons for such a procedure. The most plausible hypothesis (and it is nothing more) occurring to me is that a reasonable number of duodecimo copies were run off first; then that a few octavo copies (one hundred according to Griffith) were run off for sale as large paper copies; and finally that the immediate popularity of the satire made it advisable to print another issue of the trade or duodecimo edition from the same setting of type (a much more rapid procedure than setting up new type) in order to meet the demand and also in order to compete with Curl's prompt piracy.

But this objection of Mr. Wise, as well as my conjecture in reply, is theorizing pure and simple, and as such does not prove anything.

¹ Pp. 577-83.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 25.

The Curll piracy, he adds, was disregarded by Pope because it was not a "legitimate" edition.¹

Pope, however, knew of the Curll piracy,² and he makes no qualification to the effect that he is omitting any edition or that the list he gives is only of "legitimate" editions. Nor is this the only point in Mr. Wise's explanation that is questionable. He has no authority, so far as I know, for considering the Dublin octavo as an authorized edition, particularly since that edition printed Pope's name as author on the title-page at a time when Pope was unwilling to avow his authorship publicly, and since the Dublin edition was the only edition of 1728 to contain the names (some of them incorrect, too) instead of the initials of the characters satirized. In addition, it seems highly improbable that Pope should have distinguished between the two variants bearing "The Third Edition" upon the title-page.

There is, in my opinion, more logic in the following classification:

1. Both (or three) issues of the first edition
2. Both variants of the second edition
3. Both variants of the third edition
4. The Curll piracy
5. The Dublin octavo

Such a classification is a natural, inclusive interpretation of Pope's statement.

This 1729 caption is amplified into a note on page 81 of Volume II of the small folio *Works* (1735): "This Poem was writ in 1727. In the next year an imperfect Edition was published at Dublin, and reprinted at London in 12°. Another at Dublin, and another at London in 8°, and three others in 12° in the same year." This, as Professor Griffith pointed out,³ is the earliest "bibliography" of the *Dunciad* of 1728. Curiously enough, this bibliography has been generally neglected, probably because it appears to be inconsistent with the 1729 caption. Disregarding the first item (a reference to a Dublin edition which continues Pope's subterfuge employed in publishing the *Dunciad* in 1728 with "Dublin, Printed, London Reprinted" on the title-page so as to convey the impression to the public that the poem was by an Irish hand),⁴ there are, in order, the following editions:

¹ *Ibid.*

² See the note to l. 86 of Book I of the quarto *Dunciad* of 1729.

³ *Bibliography*, I, Part II, 283.

⁴ Pope's deception was so successful that students of Pope for over a century believed that the poem had actually been printed first in Dublin.

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. London, duodecimo | 4. London, duodecimo |
| 2. Dublin, octavo | 5. London, duodecimo |
| 3. London, octavo | 6. London, duodecimo |

This list differs in only one respect from that given in 1729—in the distinction between the two issues (one in octavo and one in duodecimo) of the first London edition. Since the 1729 statement did not give the formats of the various editions, it was not necessary to distinguish between the issues; but, with the addition of the formats, Pope naturally had to distinguish between B and C.

Such a bibliography given by Pope (or, perhaps, by his friends, who were certainly in a position to know and who had no apparent reason for misrepresenting the facts) indicates the priority of a duodecimo, followed by an octavo, followed in turn by three duodecimos. There is no external evidence to break down this order. The early advertisements of the *Dunciad* do not give the format of the book, and all the internal evidence adduced thus far can be turned two ways, though it would seem from the arguments that it is more likely that the duodecimo C preceded the octavo B.

II. INTERNAL EVIDENCE¹

By a careful comparison of the issues B and C together with D (the second edition), I have been able to procure additional light which, I believe, will be accepted as demonstrable proof that Pope's "bibliography" is correct in placing the duodecimo first.

According to signature letters, the duodecimo, Thoms's C, was printed off in five half-sheets and one sixth-sheet; the octavo B was in seven half-sheets and two quarter-sheets; and the duodecimo numbered D by Thoms was, like C, in five half-sheets and one sixth-sheet. In all these editions the pages are numbered alike, and with slight exceptions have the same matter on them page by page. For printing B and C, the same setting-up of type was used throughout; but in the rearrangement of the format, the page forms had to be opened to permit the signature letters to be changed, and on two or three pages certain small revisions were made without altering the type on the

¹ In this consideration of the internal evidence the discussion is limited to those details from which valid inferences may be drawn as to the priority of either C or B. Such matters as faulty alignment are here omitted, since argument from them is difficult.

rest of the page. The same setting-up of type was used for some half-sheets in edition D, but not for all.

So much is not in dispute and is restated here to help clarify a complicated situation. Some of the small revisions referred to are data to be used presently.

Besides signature letters at the bottom of pages, printers two hundred years ago, in the days of small hand-presses, placed Arabic numerals at the bottom of pages in what looks to a modern reader like a haphazard fashion. The purpose of these numbers was recently explained by Mr. R. W. Chapman,¹ who pointed out that they were inserted by the overseer to serve the double purpose of assigning the work to a certain press and of constituting a sort of payroll. These figures, Chapman says, were usually placed at the bottom of even pages (so as to prevent the possibility of confusion with signatures which appear regularly on odd pages), though they often appear on rectos.

All of the "legitimate" editions of the *Dunciad* of 1728 have these press numbers, but no argument has thus far been drawn from them. The numbers as they appear in C, B, and D (the second edition) are as follows:

I (THOMS'S C)	II (THOMS'S B)	III (THOMS'S D)
[A half-sheet contains twelve pages.]	[A half-sheet contains eight pages.]	[A half-sheet contains twelve pages.]
Sig. A [preliminary twelve pages]	No sig. [preliminary eight pages]	Sig. A [preliminary twelve pages]
Press No. 1 on p. iv	Press No. 1 on p. iv	Press No. 1 on p. iv
	Sig. b [preliminary four pages]	Type not reset
	No press number	
Sig. B, pp. 1-12	Sig. B, pp. 1-8	Sig. B, pp. 1-12
Press No. 1 on p. 7	Press No. 4 on p. 7	Press No. 4 on p. 2 ²
		Type reset
	Sig. C, pp. 9-16	
	Press No. 3 on p. 16	

¹ *Library*, 4th ser., II (1922), 175-76.

² The Chew-Huntington copy has press No. 3 instead of No. 4.

Sig. C, pp. 13-24
Press No. 3 on p. 24

Sig. D, pp. 17-24
Press No. 2 on p. 24

Sig. C, pp. 13-24
Press No. 4 on p. 24
Type reset

Sig. E, pp. 25-32
Press No. 2 on p. 26

Sig. D, pp. 25-36
Press No. 2 on p. 26
Type not reset for
p. 26

Sig. D, pp. 25-36
Press No. 4 on p. 36

Sig. E, pp. 37-48
Press No. 2 on p. 38

Sig. F, pp. 33-40
Press No. 2 on p. 38

Sig. E, pp. 37-48
Press No. 3 on p. 38
Type not reset for
p. 38

Sig. G, pp. 41-48
Press No. 1 on p. 47

Sig. F, pp. 49-[52]
Press No. 3 on p. 50

Sig. H, pp. 49-[52]
No press number

Sig. F, pp. 49-[52]
No press number

An examination of this table reveals that Thoms's D is much closer to B than it is to C (with the logical inference that B followed C instead of preceding it).¹

In I each gathering (or half-sheet) bears a press number, whereas in II two quarter-sheets (signatures b and H) have no numbers. III lacks a press number for the last gathering, signature F. The first issue would probably have complete press numbers. It is unlikely that III, if it followed I in order of printing, would omit a number as it does from its signature F since the books were of the same format. Instead, it is somewhat more plausible to think that in the rearrangement of the forms for II, after I had been printed, the press number was omitted for this last gathering and was not replaced for III.

In the first gathering of I, II, and III, all press numbers are alike and all appear on the same page; but this press number (1 on p. iv) in I and III provided for the first twelve pages, while in II it provided only for the first eight pages. The other four pages in the first gathering of I and III became the quarter-sheet signature b of II, which has no press number. The implication is that the duodecimo I was printed

¹ In order to avoid the almost inevitable confusion to the reader which would arise from the use of the letters "C," "B," and "D" both for the issues of the poem and for the signatures of the gatherings, I shall use I for "issue C," II for "issue B," and III for "edition D."

first and a press number supplied for this prefatory gathering, while in rearranging the forms for the octavo II the overseer of the press failed to place a number on the quarter-sheet b. Of course, no additional press number was required for III.

In I and II the next gathering (signature B in each) offers no evidence of importance. For III the type was reset for the whole gathering and the press number was placed on page 2 instead of on page 7 as in I and II. Similarly, signature C of I and III (signatures C and D of II) offer no help.

Signature D in I is composed of pages 25–36, the press number appearing on page 36. Pages 25–32 naturally had no press number, but these pages constituted a gathering (signature E) for the octavo II, and a press number became necessary. Consequently press number 2 was placed on page 26. This number appears also on page 26 of III (for which page the type was not reset). If III had followed I instead of II, the press number for its signature D should have remained on page 36 where it was in I. But, after I was printed off, forms for pages 33–36 from signature D and for pages 37–40 from signature E were tied together to constitute signature F (pp. 33–40) for the octavo II. These pages in I had two press numbers—4 on page 36 and 2 on page 38 (the numbers for signatures D and E); the first of these (4 on p. 36) was removed, hence when pages 25–36 were regathered to form signature D in III, the press number (4 on p. 36) which had been used for this signature in I was gone, while a new press number (2) had been added on page 26. This new number was naturally retained. The press number (2) on page 38 (which was present in I) remained for II, but was changed (though the substitute was placed on the same page) for III.

Issue I is the only one to have a press number for the last gathering. Had duodecimo III followed duodecimo I it is likely that it would have had a press number also.¹ In all three editions or issues this four-page gathering was struck off from the same setting of type.

The argument from these press numbers ought to be conclusive proof that the duodecimo I was printed first, the octavo II second, and the duodecimo III third (as Griffith suggested); and it becomes

¹ It may have been that, in II, signatures b and this last gathering H were combined and printed as a ligated half-sheet, during which procedure the press number which was present in I for the last gathering was lost or dropped out in the change.

more obviously conclusive if the press numbers are considered with the assumption that II was printed first, then I, then III (as Wise maintains); in which case it would be necessary to assume, for instance, that press number 2 on page 26 (signature E, pp. 25-32) of II was removed; that press number 4 was placed on page 36 to take care of signature D (pp. 25-36) in order to print I; and that this number (4 on p. 36) was removed and the original number 2 on page 26 replaced before printing off III. It is difficult to accept such an assumption.

C, then (to return to the original nomenclature now that the possibility of confusion of these letters with signature letters is past), must have been the first issue.

But there is still more evidence that this was the case.

Careful comparison of C, B, and D shows that the same setting of type was employed in all three issues (as a matter of fact, the same setting was also used for the third edition) for page 51. This page shows two variant readings which contribute additional support to the priority of C.

The first of these variant readings brings to light a hitherto-unnoted variant of B,¹ and to distinguish between these octavos I shall use B-1 and B-2.

Line 273 on page 51 reads in the various copies:

- C: "B____ sole judge. . . ."
- B-1: "B____ sole judge. . . ."²
- B-2: "B____n sole judge. . . ."³
- D: "B____n sole judge. . . ."

The change in this line (the addition of the letter *n*) was made in B-2 without resetting the type. Such a change indicates clearly that C

¹ Mr. R. W. Chapman, to whom I submitted part of this material, called my attention to what he thought was an error, but what actually resulted in the discovery of these two variants, unimportant as they are, of the octavo B.

² According to Mr. Chapman, the Wise copy of B is of this variety. Through the kindness of Mrs. Flora V. Livingston, of the Widener Memorial Library, I learn that the Lefferts copy at Harvard belongs to this group, as, so Mr. Leslie E. Bliss informs me, does the Hoe copy (annotated by Jonathan Richardson) in the Huntington Library.

³ The only copy of this variety that I know of is that in the Wrenn Library at the University of Texas. Mr. Wise, then, is correct in his insistence that the Wrenn copy is a variant of B, and he is also correct, evidently, in placing his own copy first chronologically (first only of the octavos). There yet remains to be produced proof, however, that these two octavos were of different sizes—the only distinction between them which he made. It seems more probable that the change in l. 273 was made while the octavo sheets were being run through the press.

was printed first. Had B been earlier, it would have been necessary to remove the letter *n* for the purpose of printing C and then to replace it for printing D—a highly improbable procedure.

Another variant reading occurs in line 277 on the same page:

C: "... towns [long *s*]-mens."
 B-1: "... towns [short *s*]-mens."
 B-2: "... towns [short *s*]-mens."
 D: "... towns [short *s*]-mens."

The change from the long *s* to the short *s* was also made without resetting the type. The use of this long *s* before the hyphen was an error, and it was corrected before the octavo B was printed. Here again it is foolish to assume that B was printed first, for it would then be necessary to believe that a correct short *s* was changed to an incorrect long *s* to print C and then changed back to the correct short *s* for D.

Further, Curll's piracy (CC) was very probably printed from the first issue of the first edition, because of the remarkably short time which elapsed before he was selling it (probably five or six days, including one Sunday), and it is likely that the real Dublin octavo (E) was also set up from the same source. It is significant that both of these editions were clearly printed from C—not from B—as the accompanying table shows.

1. BOOK I, LINE 1: CC and E both follow C (not B) in the reading "Books."
2. BOOK I, LINE 24: CC and E both follow C in the reading "*Quidnunc*'s" with the roman *s*; while B corrects the roman *s* to an italic *s* (since it is a plural, not a possessive form), a correction which is followed in subsequent editions.
3. BOOK I, LINE 76: CC and E both follow C in the reading "broadfaces" while B reads "broad faces" with a space between the words.
4. BOOK III, LINE 273: CC follows C in the reading "B____" and E supplies the name "Blondel"—a conjecture inconsistent with the "B____n" of B-2.
5. BOOK III, LINE 277: CC and E both follow C in the use of the long *s* in towns-mens."
6. PAGE [52]: CC follows C in advertising a forthcoming "Progress of Dulness," an advertisement which does not appear on any other issues of the *Dunciad*. E does not carry this advertisement, but it would have been pointless for the Dublin publisher to advertise a forthcoming London poem.

This table affords circumstantial evidence of considerable weight in favor of the priority of C. Other similar instances could be cited; in fact, in the case of every variant reading the Dublin edition follows C,

not B, and in every variant reading but one Curll's piracy follows C, not B. The one exception is in the spelling of "Interludes" (p. 5 n.). B and CC agree in the spelling "Interludes." Professor Griffith made the conjecture in his *Bibliography*¹ that it looked as if Curll had followed the text of C, adopting, however, the spelling "Interludes" as the author's last correction. If that were true, it is hard to understand why he did not follow some of the other "last corrections" of the author.

Professor Griffith has since advanced to me what looks like a much more plausible theory. He suggests that the spelling "Enterludes" was intentional on Pope's part—deliberate sport with the antiquarians, since all illustrations of the early use of the word in England before 1677 quoted in the *Oxford Dictionary* follow the spelling "Enterludes," whereas after 1677 the word was normally spelled with an *i*. As a matter of interest, Bailey's dictionary of 1722 (and following) does not even give the variant spelling "enterludes"; neither do other early dictionaries available to me. Pope adopted the antiquarian spelling; he read proof for C, and the poem was published with the spelling he had planned. Curll corrected the spelling in his edition to conform with his own usage (not always correct, however), just as he corrected "lye" (Book I, l. 21) to "ly"; "lie" (Book I, l. 47) to "ly"; "vallies" (Book I, l. 64) to "valleys"; "Spirits" (Book II, l. 159) to "spirts"; etc. Similarly, when Pope's printer ran off the octavo B, he corrected what he took to be a mistake in spelling when he reset the half-line "John Heywood, whose Enterludes . . ." just as Curll's printer had done. But, in later editions, Pope was careful to return to and preserve the antiquarian spelling.²

There are many more points of difference between C, B, and D than have been pointed out, but, like matters of alignment, they do not contribute much to the argument except by inferences that are often ambiguous. No point of difference, however, that could tend to contradict the conclusion that C was printed before B has been overlooked.

¹ Part I, p. 156.

² As has been pointed out on p. 61, this interesting spelling has no effect on the central argument. Professor Griffith's ingenious and plausible explanation of the difference does not, therefore, have to be accepted before C can be established as the first issue.

The evidence of Pope's own list of editions, of the press numbers, and of the textual variations on page 51 would thus seem to constitute definite proof that C was actually the first issue of the first edition of the *Dunciad*.

III. THE EDITIONS OF 1728

The use of letters of the alphabet for numbering the editions of the *Dunciad*, begun by Thoms, leads, as Griffith has said, "into so much awkwardness that it must break down sooner or later."¹ The same feeling prompted Mr. Wise to furnish a list of his own in his catalogue of the Ashley Library, though his list cannot, as he claims, "be found convincing and final" in the light of the arguments here presented. Somewhat cautiously, therefore, I suggest the following list:

1a

Duodecimo in half-sheets. Published May 18, 1728. Thoms's C, Wise's No. 3, Griffith's Book No. 198. The first issue of the first edition. This is the only issue of the authorized duodecimo which contains the reading (Book III, l. 277) "... towns [long s]-mens."²

1b

Octavo in half-sheets. Published May 18-24, 1728. Thoms's B, Wise's No. 1, Griffith's Book No. 199. The first variant of the second issue of the first edition. To be of this variety, a copy must contain both readings (Book I, l. 1) "Book and" and (Book III, l. 277) "B_____ sole judge."

1c

Octavo in half-sheets. Published May 18-24, 1728. Not listed by Thoms, perhaps Wise's No. 2, not listed by Griffith. The second variant of the second issue of the first edition. This variant must read (Book I, l. 1) "Book and" and (Book III, l. 277) "B_____n sole judge."

2

Duodecimo in half-sheets. Published May 24 (?), 1728. Thoms's CC, Wise's No. 9, Griffith's Book No. 200. A piracy from the shop of Edmund Curll. This edition contains the unique and famous reading (Book I, l. 76) "Gold chains."

¹ "The *Dunciad* of 1728," *op. cit.*, p. 11.

² It is not my purpose to give an exhaustive list of variations between editions but to give a minimum number of distinguishing marks in order to enable a student to identify any copy before him. For more complete lists of the differences see Griffith, *ibid.*, p. 12, his *Bibliography*, Part I, pp. 152-60; Part II, pp. 576-77, and Wise, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-25.

3a

Duodecimo in half-sheets. Published May 24, 1728. Not in Thoms's list Wise's No. 4, Griffith's Book No. 201. The first variant of the second edition. This variant is distinguished solely by the misprint "Dudlin" for "Dublin" on the title-page.

3b

Duodecimo in half-sheets. Published May 27-31 (?), 1728. This is Thoms's D, Wise's No. 5, Griffith's Book No. 202. The second variant of the second edition. This copy has "Dublin" spelled correctly on the title-page.

4a

Duodecimo in half-sheets. Published June 8, 1728. Thoms's DD, Wise's No. 6, Griffith's Book No. 203. The first variant of the third edition. Book II, line 367, reads "*C_____re. . . .*"

4b

Duodecimo in half-sheets. Published June 8-15 (?), 1728. Thoms's D2, Wise's No. 7, Griffith's Book No. 204. The second variant of the third edition. This variant reads (Book II, l. 367) "*Centlivre. . . .*"

5

Octavo in half-sheets. Published July 15 (or earlier), 1728. Thoms's E, Wise's No. 8, Griffith's Book No. 206. The genuine Dublin edition which is distinguished by the title-page.

Of these editions, issues and variants, it is certain that Pope read proof for 1a, but it is improbable that he read proof for any other copy. He contributed a correction or two to 3a and to both 4a and 4b, the last of which must be considered the most authoritative text for that stage of the poem. He had nothing whatever to do, so far as we know, either with the Dublin edition or with Curll's piracy.

W. K. CHANDLER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

